Case 1:07-cv-70342-848, Aggument 9/2 Filed 07/06/2007 Page 1 of 4 For The District of Delaware

Anson I. bibbs, Sa.

Plaintiff,

-Civ. Act. No. 07-343-SLR

Ruth Ann Minnen, bovennon, et al.

Juny Trial Demanded

Defendants.

Motion For Leave To File An Amended Complaint



Civ. P. 15 (c), nequest leave for an amended Complaint to add the Following Densons as detendants and co-conspirators to the Plaintiffs Original Complaint dated 5-23-07, and Plaintiffs amended Complaint dated 6-4-07.

Due to neasons beyond plaintiff's control, the plaintiff was unable to add the following fensons to his amended Comflaint Filed with the Count dated 6-4-07, for lack of legal in formation.

- 2). The needed information has been frovided and the Plaintiff fresent this Motion for leave to file an amended Complaint adding the following fensons as defendants. Donald V. Cook County Shen: It's Dept., 95. F. 32 548, 554-56 (74h Cin. 1996).
- Defendant, William L. Witham, Gn., Gudge of the Superion Count, Kent County, Doven, Delawane 19901.
- Count, Kent County, Doven, Delaware 19903.
- 2). Detendant, Holland, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Dover, Delaware 1990s.
- Court, Kent County, Doven, Delaware 19903.
- D. These four detendants are being sned in their individual Capacity, subject to the neliet as set forth in original Complaint, including fanagraph 33, to which plaintiff reiterate against these four detendants.
- OIt is held that although judges enjoy absolute immunity From liability and damages for their judicial or adjudicatory acts, they are not absolutely immune in their performance of administrative and executive Functions. See Monnison V. Lips-Comb 877 F. 22 463, 466 (64h Cin. 1989); Fornester V. White, 484 h.S. 219, 227 (1988)

These four defendants are not absolutely immune for their executive actions declaring that, the plaintiff was not entitled to a Writ of Habeas Corpus because the Plaintiff was detained on a Kelony Change. (10 Del. C. Subsec. 6902(1)). Non are these four defendants entitled to qualified immunity, because the night violated was already established by the Constitution of the United States at the time of the Violation U.S. C. A. Const. Ant. 1, sec. 9, Cl. 2); See Conn V. Cabbert, 236 U.S. 286, 290 (1999); Wilson V. Layne, 526 U.S. 603, 609 (1999); Harlow V. Fitzgenald, 455 U.S. 800, 818 (1982).

10. Delaware Constitution Anticle IV, Section 2; sets forth the qualifications in order to be a judge of the State of Delaware. "Shall be Citizens of the State and Learned in the Law."

Misse known that their executive actions Committed in scope 10 Del. C. subsec. 6902(1), was contrary to Ant. 1, sec. 9, C12 of the Constitution of the United States, and would violate flaintités right to due process, às Well as plaintités right of access to the Court as provided for under the provisions of the Habeas Conpus Statute set forth in the Constitution of the United States (U.S. C. A. Const. Amend. I. and XIV). These four defendants had the fower and authority to rule 10 Del. C. subsec. 6902(1) às un constitutional, but failed to do so. (h.S.C.A. Const. Ant. III).

13) Junsuant to Del. Const. Ant. XV, Sec. 9; in scope of U.S.C. A. Const. Ant. I, Sec. 6 and Sec. 9, C/2, and 10 Del. C. Subsec. 6902 (1), the Count must draw strong inferences and accept as true that, Del. Const. Ant. XV, Sec. 9 (Prefixing Constitution to codificution of laws) refer to the Constitution of the united States.

14) All (67) Letendants mentioned in this Civil Action Conspined to intentionally violate the Constitution of the united States, as Well'as the rights of the Plaintiff, while acting under Colon of State Law.

Whenefore: For the reasons stated herein the flint: If fray that the Court Will grant leave to file an amended complaint.

Dated: 7-3-07

flaintiff, Colison S. Gibbs, S. Anson I. bibbs, Sn. St. 861982 1181 Jaddock Road Smyrna, Delawane 19977.